

**WSDOT/ACEC-WA Project Delivery Team**  
**October 14, 2005**  
**HNTB, Bellevue, Washington**

**Attendees**

ACEC

Rick Door  
Mary Holland  
Mike Mariano  
John Villager

WSDOT

Kirk Berg  
Doyle Dilley  
Ron Landon  
Keith Metcalf  
Amir Rasaie  
Ken Smith  
Rick Smith  
Adele McCormick, Recorder

**Review and Finalize Meeting Agenda**

**Draft recommendation on co-location of training**

The co-location of training recommendation was tabled until the next meeting. This recommendation has not been written yet.

**Action Item: Karl Winterstein, Doyle Dilley, and John Villager will draft the co-location recommendation and send it out for review before the next meeting.**

Should the WSDOT/ACEC-WA Project Delivery Team take the initiative to push appropriate co-location training? Jeff Bailey is developing a class for managing consultant contracts, but it is not getting enough support to bring it up quickly. Is the process we are currently teaching the process that is actually being used to develop contracts?

**Action Item: Mike Mariano will invite Jeff Bailey to the next meeting (November 4) to talk to the team about where they are with the managing consultant contracts class and what the class syllabus is. Send the updated syllabus to this team ahead of time.**

**Status of John Bauer article communicating decision to move to InRoads**

**Handout:** *WSDOT Adopts Bentley InRoads*

Ken Smith e-mailed the article *WSDOT Adopts Bentley InRoads* to the team members earlier this week.

There are advantages to joint WSDOT/consultant training. If the consultant pays for the training, can they attend? WSDOT has prepaid training for WSDOT only as part of the site license agreement. Workstations are set up for the training in the region. In theory, if there is an empty workstation, a consultant could use it. What does the license say?

How can we expect the consultants to come in with knowledge of the use of the product without training? Consultants can attend the Bentley training – this discussion is regarding WSDOT-sponsored training. Even though consultants already use InRoads, there may be issues with using it for WSDOT projects. WSDOT training is different than the general Bentley InRoads training.

The WSDOT training has been offered since May or June, but only on a limited basis because WSDOT had a limited number of licenses. How does this affect local agencies?

**Action Item: John Villager will have the information in the handout published in the ACEC newsletter. He will contact John Bauer to get the electronic file. The last statement in the document needs to be clarified.**

There is an issue with resource files being shared. The consultant agreement language says the consultant will use the WSDOT resource files.

WSDOT will support CaiCE as long as there are projects currently in progress and on the shelf that were built in CaiCE.

### **Status of Change Recommendations**

Handout: ACEC/WSDOT Project Delivery Team Recommendations

Note that some of the recommendations have not been denied – they have been deferred.

Recommendation 2 – We are asking that the Department of Revenue find some way to exempt the design portion of highway projects from sales tax. The Department of Revenue suggested that we ask for a total exemption, because this would be difficult to separate out. This would be a big savings, but may result in dead legislation.

Recommendation 3 – The timing is not right, but we should start pushing it again in early 2006 to develop legislation with the correct wording. This team should keep it alive. Revisit this in April and May to be prepared for June cutoff.

Recommendation 4 – Chapter 1425 is at FHWA right now.

Recommendation 5 – There is some problem. FHWA is checking to see if there is a CFR that prevents it. This is currently being looked at.

Recommendations 6 and 7 – Have been approved by stakeholder and are beginning implementation.

Recommendations 6 and 7 and the current Recommendation Tracking Sheet are on-line now.

Recommendation 7 – There is an error on the tracking sheet. The implementation date is December 2005, not 2006.

Tom Swafford is not involved with consultant agreements. It may be appropriate for this team to take on consultant agreement issues.

**Update on discussions regarding supplementing work forces in smaller regions**  
**Rick Smith**

The issue of supplementing work forces in smaller regions came up at the Project Development Engineers conference last spring. We have an agreement with ACEC that we will only open the on-call list every two years. The eventual approach will be that the next time we open the on-calls we will let the smaller consultants know it is the time to get on the list. However, during the interim we will engage the smaller consultants with a list of projects we know we are going to do in the next short while, and hire the consultants we want for these specific projects. North Central will be doing some sort of solicitation to engage small consultants in their region until we do a general on-call.

What issues does that present for smaller consultants in other areas of the state? Going out with an RFP with project specifics appears to be a good way to handle this. It doesn't prevent a number of local consultants from teaming up.

It may help to make the next RFQ more general in allowing crossovers between different areas: design, construction, traffic, etc.

There is a provision that allows the Department to make changes in the agreement – a change order process. Different regions have different needs and issues. Some of the issues deal with meeting WSDOT certification requirements.

Should we recommend revising the way we do the next on-call solicitation?

We should consider going to a prequalification process, which would save a significant amount of work when the need for consultant services comes up.

**Action Item: Doyle Dilley will draft a recommendation for changing how we solicit for consultants that will document the current on-call process, the issues with it, and improvement opportunities.**

**Review/Discussion of QA/QC Plan Activity Guide**  
**Ken Smith**

Handout: Activity Guide and Template

The handout shows what we have for a quality control plan for the on-line guide. What can we do better? The consultant who wrote the activity guide looked at PEMBOK.

We are looking for a tool that will be useful for delivering the project – not just a form to file away in a book somewhere.

What can we do with it? It is very generic. Is there enough detail?

Mary Holland brought an example of a checklist they use to determine percentages of completion.

**Action Item: Amir Rasaie will send Adele McCormick a paper on Constructibility that will be put on the sharing page of the website.**

There are a variety of ways to implement QA/QC and a variety of tools that can be used.

The Project Management Plan may be the place to bring this all together. This is where you define the necessary quality control items to make the project successful.

**Action Item: Adele McCormick will post the constructibility review guide, as written by TRANSPEED and the draft constructibility chapter that didn't make it into the *Design Manual* on the website. We will also obtain the checklist being handed out in training classes.**

**Action Item: Ken will assign someone to find information and examples from other states.**

There are not enough backup examples on the on-line guide. This may be a minimum, but what happens with more involved, larger projects?

### **Discussion of Project Delivery Legal Requirements Rick Smith**

Rick Smith demonstrated on-line project delivery tools for project delivery requirements and the Excel file of Project Delivery Requirements that can be downloaded. The on-line web pages should be active within a month.

**Action Item: Adele will send the Excel File of Project Delivery Requirements to the team members.**

The regions need to be told about the on-line guide. Some of the people who need it don't know it exists yet. This needs to be presented to everyone.

### **Additions to the team's brainstorm list of topics for discussion/action**

- How do we define quality?
- Draft recommendation – prequalified consultant list vs. RFPs and RFQs

### **Next meeting agenda:**

- QA/QC – review the documents on the Sharing page of the website. Adele will send out a message when they are there. Potentially draft guidance or tools out of this group. Clearly identifying what 30%, 60%, etc., is and what we should be

looking for at each milestone. There needs to be some flexibility in this so it isn't hard and fast policy for everyone. Tools vs. guidance.

- Carryover of co-location training – John Villager and Doyle Dilley – Recommendation #9 – draft and send out ahead of next meeting.
- Highlights of new federal highway bill – Rick Smith
- Mike Mariano will contact Jeff Bailey from Transpeed regarding managing consultants training and send a syllabus out to this team ahead of the next meeting.
- Recommendation on prequalification vs. RFP/RFQ. Review Recommendation #8 and submit comments back to Doyle Dilley to get it ready to move on.

### Next meeting

November 4, 2005, Lakewood Maintenance Facility

